

REMARKS

Rejections under section 112

Claim 7 has been amended to remove language objected to by the Examiner. This change does not narrow the claim, but rather broadens it by removing potential limitations. New claims 9 and 10 have been added corresponding to the deleted material from claim 7. Though these changes have been made herein in an effort to advance prosecution and improve the form of the claims, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection under section 112. This rejection would have been better phrased as an objection, since the issue pointed to failed to rise to the level of true indefiniteness under section 112, and instead related to issues of style and preference.

Art rejections

The art rejections are respectfully traversed, except as indicated below.

Since a number of references are involved, Applicant will confine his remarks to those portions of the references cited by the Examiner, except as otherwise indicated. Applicant makes no representation as to the contents of other portions of the references.

Any of the Examiner's rejections and/or points of argument that are not addressed below would appear to be moot in view of the following. Nevertheless, Applicant reserves the right to respond to those rejections and arguments and to advance additional arguments at a later date. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded. Amendments are made without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to pursue any canceled subject matter in this or a related application.

REMARKS

Claims 1/11

Claim 1 has been canceled and new claim 11 is substituted. New claim 11 recites a plurality of non-movable reference elements having fixed, non-uniform sizes and coupled with the base for positioning the burner. The non-uniformity of the reference elements is customized to achieve a desired alignment of a beam of light from the burner relative to a portion of the lamp. Applicant respectfully submits that this distinguishes patentably over the reference where the reference elements are uniform and are not customized to achieve a desired alignment of a light beam.

Dependent claims 2-5 have been amended to make them dependent on new claim 11. Claim 5 has been further amended to make its language consistent with claim 11. This amendment of claim language is not believed to affect the scope of the claim, but merely to reflect issues of grammar.

Claims 6/14

Claim 6 has been cancelled. New claim 14 is substituted. New claim 14 recites customizing the reference elements to fixed, non-uniform sizes, responsive to a desired alignment of a light beam emerging from the assembly. The references fail to teach or suggest such non-uniform sizes. It should be noted that Bellows, col. 1, l.17 speaks of “grinding exterior locators to a reference level,” namely a single reference level. It appears, therefore, from this single line, without further elaboration given, that the reference discusses a different, possibly less precise use of a locator from that contemplated by the invention. Indeed, later on, Bellows discusses using leads extended through eyelets to adjust position.

REMARKS

Dependent claims 7-10 have been made dependent on new claim 14. Claims 7 and 8 have been amended further to make their language consistent with that of claim 14. These language changes are believed not to affect the scope of the claim and to relate only to issues of grammar.

Other new claims

New claims 12 and 15 relate to addition of a reflector and the reflector engaging contact surfaces of the non-uniform reference elements to achieve a desired beam alignment. Applicant respectfully submits that this is not taught or suggested by the references.

New claims 13 and 16 recite that at least one of the reference elements is shorter than another of the reference elements. Applicant respectfully submits that this is not taught or suggested by the references.

Please charge any fees other than the issue fee to deposit account 14-1270. Please credit any overpayments to the same account.

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully submits that he has addressed each issue raised by the Examiner — except for any that were skipped as moot — and that the application is accordingly in condition for allowance. Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By *Anne E. Barschall*
Anne E. Barschall, Reg. No. 31,089
Tel. no. 914-332-1019
Fax no. 914-332-7719
Date of printing: June 13, 2008

In house contact at assignee:
Christopher Ries
Reg. No. 45,799
Tel. # 914-945-6000